



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/776,858	02/06/2001	Kiyoshi Inamochi	010118	6845

23850 7590 07/05/2006

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP  
1725 K STREET, NW  
SUITE 1000  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, NGA B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3628

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/776,858

Applicant(s)

INAMOCHI, KIYOSHI

Examiner

Nga B. Nguyen

Art Unit

3628

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 12 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).


4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
NGA NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 3. NOTE: In response to applicant's arguments that there is no mention of processing state "tables" in Semple et al., examiner submits that although Semple et al. do not mention the words state "tables", but Semple et al. provides a normal user interface to both ATM transactions and the access to the Internet (see column 4, lines 47-50). Moreover, a normal transaction-use state table is defined in the applicant's invention as a plurality of states on normal ATM transactions described in the figures 9-14 (state tables A through J), is well known in the conventional ATM. Because Semple et al. provides a normal user interface to ATM transactions, it is inherent that the system of Semple et al. must store a normal transaction-use processing state table such as a plurality of states on normal ATM transactions described in the figures 9-14 in the applicant's invention, in order to provide a normal user interface to ATM transactions. The same for WEB transaction-use processing state table, because Semple et al. provides the access to the Internet, it is inherent that the system of Semple et al. must store a plurality of html pages (or WEB transaction-use processing state table) in order to provide the access to the Internet. Therefore, Semple et al. inherently teaches both a normal transaction-use processing state table and a WEB transaction-use processing state table. Moreover, Semple does not disclose the WEB transaction-use processing state table includes: a specification of a screen displayed upon access to a WEB server; a definition of an extension file including a part of definition of the state; a specification of a screen upon printing a receipt; a specification of a screen upon outputting the receipt; a specification of the next processing state table upon completion of a normal WEB transaction; a specification of the next processing state table upon completion of a WEB transaction with a predetermined code; a specification of a screen in the event of time out during the first URL navigation, a specification of an extension processing state table being allowed to include the state of a screen in the event of time-out during the first URL navigation, a specification of URL to which a navigation is made in the event of an error, a specification of a timer determining time-out of the URL navigation made in the event of an error, and a specification of display time of a display used upon detection of the time-out of the first URL navigation. However, Flenley discloses the WEB transaction-use processing state table include: a specification of a screen displayed upon access to a WEB server; a specification of an extension file in which one portion of the definition for the WEB transaction is written (column 2, lines 5-60). Moreover, the rest of features are well known in the art of accessing the Internet. For example, when a user conducts transactions over the Internet, the web pages written in html displaying to the user that a receipt is printing, receipt is outputting, a transaction confirmation page with a transaction ID upon the user completes the transaction, a page with message "the page has been expired" displayed to the user when the user tries to obtain the previous pages by clicking the back button in the toolbar, a page displayed an error message when the user try to access a not existing web site, etc...Therefore, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Semple's to combine the teaching of Flenley and the well known features above for the purpose of assisting the customer to access and retrieve information over the Internet...